DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 106 EA 012 302

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | McDonald, Milton S.: And Others |
| TITLE | Administrator Evaluation: A Look at Georgia and the Nation. Georgia Professional Standards Commission Issues for Education Series. |
| INSTITUTION | Georgia Professional Standards Commission, Atlanta. |
| PUB DATE | 79 |
| NOTE | 47p.: Appendices may not reproduce clearly due to small print |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 1645 Tullie Circle, N.E., Suite 105, Atlanta GA 30329 (Free to appropriate educational organizations and professionals while supply lasts) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC02 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Administrator Attitudes: *Administrator Evaluation: *Educational Trends: Elementary Secondary Education: Literature Reviews: *Principals: School Surveys: State Legislation |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Georgia |

ABSTRACT

The recommendations contained in this publication regarding the evaluation of administrators are based on research conducted by the Professional Standards Commission of the state of Georgia. The booklet explores administrator evaluation in Georgia and national trends and events, including state mandated programs. Discussed are the results of a survey to determine how school district administrators are evaluated. A second phase of the research, also discussed, is how principals regard their own evaluation. Responses from 64 percent from the 187 school districts in Georgia are represented in table form. In phase 2 of the study, 135 principals from 125 different school districts were interviewed, and data are categorized by size of the district and type of school administered. Principals surveyed said that the important keys to successful administrator evaluation are the competence of the person who evaluates and the validity of the instrument used. An extensive bibliography and sample evaluation forms are also included. (Author/LD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Mc Donald

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED180106

EA 012 302

Georgia

# PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION

Issues for Education Series

# Administrator Evaluation

## A Look at Georgia and the Nation

Milton S. McDonald
Chairman

Richard C. Owens
Vice-Chairman

Suzann R. Harrison
Administrative Assistant

Georgia Professional Standards Commission
Suite 105
1645 Tullie Circle, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30329

# CONTENTS


From The Commission Chairman ..... 5

Introduction ..... 7

Commission Administrator Evaluation Recommendations ..... 10

State Board Response ..... 11

Administrator Evaluation In Georgia ..... 12

- How School District Administrators Are Evaluated ..... 14
- How Principals Regard Their Own Evaluation ..... 18

National Trends And Events ..... 21

- State-Mandated Programs ..... 22
- National Trends ..... 26
- Update ..... 30

Bibliography ..... 34

Appendices ..... 40

- Teacher Evaluation Form (Oregon)
- Principal Evaluation Form (Hawaii)
- Superintendent Evaluation Form (Fort Worth)
- Superintendent Evaluation Form (Tulsa)

# From The Commission Chairman

On June 14, 1979, in its Annual Report to the State Board of Education, the Professional Standards Commission presented recommendations regarding evaluation of administrators. Briefly these recommendations ask that the State Board of Education adopt policies that will require local boards of education to develop and implement policies and procedures for the annual formal evaluation of all administrative personnel for the purpose of improving the total educational program by emphasizing self-improvement and professional development among educational leaders.

The recommendations are based on research conducted by the Commission on current evaluation practices for administrators in Georgia, on testimony received through open hearings held by the Commission across the State, on consultation with experts in the field of educational administration, on information provided by professional educators, and on a review of existing research and practices in the areas of administrator evaluation.

The Commission recognizes the caution and concern that exist in regard to the possible implementation of these recommendations. As Georgia educators and laymen formulate their position on this important and vital educational issue, we hope, and believe, that the following objective summary of some of the extensive information which the Commission has assembled on the topic of Administrator Evaluation will be of significant interest and assistance.

Milton S. McDonald

MILTON S. MCDONALD
Chairman

# Introduction

Over the past two decades, the concept of evaluation in the field of education has undergone considerable change with respect to both program evaluation and personnel evaluation.

Public demand for "quality education," rising costs, continuing debate over educational accountability—all have contributed to increased time, money, and personnel to address the question of quality educational performance. A number of methods and procedures have been devised, especially with respect to evaluation of teacher performance.

Systematic evaluation of school administrative personnel is a more recent development in the quest for educational accountability. However, it appears to be gaining momentum. A survey by the Educational Research Service finds that in school districts with 25,000 or more students, the percentage of districts formally evaluating administrators increased from 40 percent in 1968 to 54 percent in 1971.

In 1977 the American Association of School Administrators reaffirmed its continuing interest in administrative evaluation. It adopted this resolution:

> AASA believes that evaluation of administrators should be encouraged. AASA urges boards of education to adopt systems of evaluation of administrators to assume their responsibility for the evaluation of the superintendent of schools. AASA further urges superintendents and other administrators to assume responsibility for the evaluation of all other administrators.

Despite widespread advocacy of formal evaluation for school administrators as a necessary, vital component for educational improvement, many school systems have not yet elected to develop a performance appraisal plan. And, considerable disagreement exists concerning what type appraisal should be employed.

The Commission's survey of the literature emphasizes that the evaluation component can improve and strengthen each aspect of the roles of administrative and supervisory personnel. As the first evaluations of teachers were primarily for regulation and examination, performance appraisal of administrators arose originally for contract renewal. However, the concept of administrator evaluation is moving toward including developmental and self-improvement activities as well as competency specification and goal establishment.

A 1971 Educational Research Service survey identified 12 basic types of evaluation procedures for administrators in 84 systems. Further analysis categorized these 12 into two major types:

- Lists of predetermined performance standards, and
- Job performance goals tailored to the evaluation of the individual and his/her major areas of responsibility.

The need for an effective method to ensure clear communication and mutual understanding of goals exists in all educational areas and is perhaps most evident in districts where size hampers such communication. Such concerns may be addressed through a comprehensive program of administrative evaluation. Smaller districts, as well, could benefit, especially where homogeneity or apathy may impede improvement in the progress of teaching and administration.

Evaluation of educational personnel has been present in American schools since the formation of schools by law in 1642. Originally, this responsibility was discharged by leading community citizens for control and inspection purposes. The local minister was generally included in the group. Such observations continued until the 1860's.

The responsibility for evaluation gradually shifted to the person appointed "head teacher," thereby laying the foundation for education assessment performed by educational personnel. The 19th century also generally saw the advent of the positions of principal and superintendent. Thus, while the person(s) doing the evaluation shifted during this century, control and observation continued to be the dominant motivation for educational evaluation.

At the turn of the twentieth century, evaluation began to focus on classroom behavior of students and teachers. Efforts to develop some instrument to aid in classroom observation began. But the major purpose for these initial forms was to observe and describe the behavior of teachers.

As instruments were developed, rating scales became a popular method for evaluating efficiency. One such scale called for assigning values on scales delineating such tasks as:

- Window sashes are lowered at least six inches from the top;
- Window shades are adjusted not to obstruct fresh air inlets;
- Blackboards are erased at the close of each period;
- Waste paper is deposited in the waste paper basket;
- Pupils sit erect with feet on the floor.

This and other instruments make clear that up to 1930 the major reasons for conducting observations of classroom teachers were to control behavior and to describe teacher behavior in various classroom settings.

In the 1930's research was recognized as offering a new impetus for classroom observations. In 1934 ways appeared to measure classroom behavior through sociometric techniques. In the same decade an instrument to describe the effects of a teacher's dominative and integrative behavior on children was developed.

In the 1950's interaction analysis gained attention as yet another method of evaluating educational personnel in the classroom.

Accountability, a term which became popular during the 1960's, gave further impetus to the concept of educational evaluation. Not only were teachers and educational programs to be held accountable,

but the demand also arose for formal evaluation of school administrators.

Traditionally, management and business administration have led in the design and implementation of performance appraisal programs for executive personnel. Educators have had little experience with administrator evaluation and have, to some extent, borrowed and built upon the concepts developed in business and industry. Early evaluations of administrators were based on such qualities as integrity and leadership ability. Now, educators and legislators are involved in considerable debate as they attempt to ascertain what kind of accountability shall prevail

Some have identified the problems involved as:

- To what extent should each participant in the educational process—teacher, principal, and administrator—be held responsible for the results?
- To whom should they be responsible?
- How are "results" to be defined and measured?

Below, in two major sections—Administrator Evaluation in Georgia and National Trends and Events—the Commission presents a summary of its study in this area. Systems considering whether to require such evaluations or what to include in such evaluations will find the information informative and useful.

# Commission Administrator Evaluation Recommendations

In response to its legislated mandate "to advise the State Board of Education concerning the preparation, certification, and professional growth of those persons who teach or perform duties in the school systems or schools of this State," the Commission, on June 14, 1979, submitted to the State Board of Education the following recommendations concerning administrator evaluation:

- The Professional Standards Commission recommends that the State Board of Education establish policies that will require local boards of education to develop and implement specific policies and procedures for the annual formal evaluation of all administrative personnel. The purpose of said policies should be to improve the total educational program by encouraging local boards of education to adopt evaluation systems that emphasize self-improvement and professional development among educational leaders.

- The Professional Standards Commission recommends that any guidelines for the implementation of any administrative evaluation policy of the State Board of Education by local boards of education shall include procedures that: require annual formal evaluations; foster self-improvement and professional development rather than merely serving for contract renewal; are consistent, objective, and fair; minimize subjective opinion and political abuse; are judiciously planned, coordinated, and implemented; reflect the involvement of administrators, parents, students, and teachers in their development and in the implementation; and are based on written, explicit job descriptions.

- The Professional Standards Commission recommends that the local boards of education use administrator evaluation data as one source of information for a needs assessment when designing local staff development programs for administrative personnel. That emphasis may be realized by the inclusion of such recommendation in the application of the local school system for State staff development funds.

# State Board Response

The Commission presented its proposals for the evaluation of administrators to the State Board of Education on June 14, 1979.

The State Board referred the recommendations to its Subcommittee on Standards-Planning and Development. That Subcommittee considered the proposals at its July, August, and September meetings.

On October 10, 1979, the State Board met as a committee of the whole to consider the recommendations.

By a vote of 5-4, the recommendations were rejected.

# Administrator Evaluation In Georgia

Accurate appraisal of administrative performance continues to be an important consideration of school administrators throughout the country and in the State of Georgia. Many principals and other administrators are currently being asked—and the trend seems to indicate that more will be asked in the future—to assist in designing or revising administrative appraisal systems that can be used effectively to improve educational leadership.

A survey of current evaluation practices for administrators in Georgia, conducted by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission, reveals some interesting points that those with an interest in the design, function, and purpose of administrator evaluation materials may find useful. This survey reflects a rather common pattern of administrator evaluation throughout the State. Any differences between "elected" and "appointed" districts can usually be explained by the difference in size of typical districts in each category.

After the superintendents, the building principal is the most frequently evaluated administrator, the survey reveals. Typically, such evaluation occurs in a personal conference with the superintendent. If a rating device is used, that rating device is some sort of checklist or observation guide. The superintendent is the key person in developing and conducting administrator evaluations. Superintendents are not, the survey finds, being pushed to exhibit an interest in administrator evaluation. Their interest stems from a sincere desire to improve the effectiveness of administrators in their districts.

Principals in the smaller districts, on the whole, are satisfied with their current evaluation procedures. They greatly value the close interaction among all levels of administrators, frequently enjoyed in their districts. Evaluations of those principals, by and large, are less formalized than in larger districts. Although not threatened by a more formalized or structured system of evaluation, principals in small districts do not wish to participate in a system they view as erecting a barrier to communication rather than serving as a facilitator of communication and interaction with their superiors.

Unlike most principals in the smaller districts, many principals in the larger districts report that they are evaluated formally. And, a significant percentage are not satisfied with the way this evaluation is being conducted. This dissatisfaction seems to arise not from the concept of being evaluated but from the method of evaluation and the seemingly unknown use of the evaluation.

Both groups, the survey shows, agree, however, that administrator evaluation can improve and strengthen every aspect of the roles of administrators and supervisory personnel. They feel that the primary focus of administrator evaluation should relate to self-improvement and professional development. And, administrators from smaller districts with less formalized evaluation procedures as well as those in larger districts with more formalized procedures would encourage any system of evaluation that will enhance communication with superordinates and subordinates.

As principals reflect upon the type of evaluation program they would like to see instituted, several patterns emerge. First, principals

do not want an evaluation program to be put together hastily, nor taken lightly. They favor a comprehensive investigation involving a number of people in developing an evaluation process so that the best thinking can be brought to bear on this issue. And, they want to participate in this process.

Moreover, the survey reveals, principals wish to see controls built in at every stage of any evaluation program. This is viewed as important to ensure objectivity, fairness, concern for the individual, and consistency in an administration of the procedures.

The survey suggests conclusively that principals in Georgia hold a readiness for administrator evaluation. They are aware of the nationwide trends in the direction of more formalized administrator evaluations. They understand the opportunities that can accrue from a thoughtfully planned, coordinated, and implemented evaluation program. Such a program, they feel, will enhance individual administrator efforts toward educational excellence in Georgia.

Many Georgia principals, the survey reveals, feel that the management by objectives (MBO) approach to administrator evaluation—either separately or combined with some type of checklist—may be an area to pursue for educators in the State who are addressing the issue of administrator evaluation.

There is growing evidence being advanced by organizational theorists that most institutions—including schools—possess unique environments with different sets of goals, programs, expectations, and constituencies. Literature in the field suggests a strong support for evaluating personnel on the basis of their ability to serve their unique constituencies. Therefore, it can be concluded that administrator appraisal must have a relationship to the unique work setting. This, in effect, gives strong support to a system that relates administrator performance to his or her work environment. Such a system would bring to the fore the administrator's performance as it relates to the school's unique set of goals and community expectations.

Effective appraisal can be conducted only in the context of the setting where the administrator functions. Therefore, appraisal for the purpose of reemployment, professional growth, and development must reflect the administrator's performance as a function of achieving specific outcomes.

In summary, the survey resulted in several major findings that may provide specific directions for administrator evaluation in Georgia:

- There are no differences between evaluation practices for administrators in school systems that have elected superintendents and those with appointed superintendents.
- Most principals in the State are evaluated. Generally, that evaluation takes the form of an informal appraisal of performance in smaller districts and a more formalized (structured) evaluation in the larger districts of the State. The informal appraisal is usually conducted in a conference setting. Formal evaluation utilizes various types of checklists followed by conferences with the superintendent or some other superordinates.

• The primary focus of administrator evaluation should relate to self-improvement and professional development.

• Administrators in the State would encourage any system of evaluation that will enhance communication with superordinates and subordinates.

• Persons being evaluated should know the purpose of the evaluation.

• Any attempt to develop an evaluation system for administrators should include contributions from the persons affected by the work of the administrators.

• Although the results of the study reflect a need for improved instruments for administrator evaluation, there is strong support in the professional literature and among principals in Georgia for a system that possesses the inherent qualities and opportunities of the management by objectives approach.

The foregoing are highlights of a survey conducted by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission to determine how school district administrators are evaluated. The second phase of the study consisted of an interview study with a representative sample of principals throughout the State of Georgia, primarily to explore their feelings and suggestions regarding their own evaluation.

A response rate of 64 percent from the 187 school districts in Georgia is represented in the highlights above and in the tables and other information below. In Phase 2 of the study, 135 principals from 125 different school districts were interviewed. Data from the interviews were categorized by the size of the school district the principal represented (small, medium, or large) and by the type of school administered (elementary, junior high/middle school, or high school).

For both phases of the study—superintendents and principals—districts with fewer than 3000 students were designated small districts. Medium districts are those with a student population of more than 3000 but fewer than 6000. Districts with a student enrollment of more than 6000 are designated large systems.

This research was conducted by a four-member research team from the faculty of the School of Education at Georgia State University. A majority of the in-State research was gathered throughout the summer and fall of 1977.

## How School District Administrators Are Evaluated

Phase I of the research was conducted to determine how school district administrators are evaluated. Information was gathered about which administrators are included in the evaluation process, what instruments are utilized, who is responsible for evaluating, and who participates in developing the evaluation process. Data from the instruments are categorized according to the method by which superintendents are selected (appointed or elected) and by the size of the district (small, medium, large).

Results of the survey, in tabular format, are presented below:

## Table 1

**RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND BY METHOD OF SUPERINTENDENT SELECTION**

| Site of District | Appointed Superintendent | Elected Superintendent | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Small | 76% (22 respondents from 29 districts) | 53% (42 r. from 79 d.) | 59% (64 r. from 100 d.) |
| Medium | 83% (15 respondents from 18 districts) | 59% (17 r. from 29 d.) | 68% (32 r. from 47 d.) |
| Large | 82% (1 respondent from 22 districts) | 55% (6 r. from 11 d.) | 73% (24 r. from 33 d.) |
| **TOTALS** | 80% (55 respondents from 69 districts) | 55% (65 r. from 119 d.) | 64% (120 r. from 187 d.) |

## Table 2

**ADMINISTRATORS WHO ARE EVALUATED: LISTED BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND BY METHOD OF SUPERINTENDENT SELECTION**

| | Assistant Superintendent | Supervisor | Other Centra Office | Principals | Other Building Administrators |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elect. Supt. (Total Sample) | 40% | 61% | 53% | 96% | 35% |
| A. Small | 31% | 56% | 51% | 95% | 21% |
| B. Medium | 50% | 71% | 64% | 100% | 50% |
| C. Large | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Appointed Supt. (Total Sample) | 61% | 75% | 65% | 100% | 35% |
| A. Small | 22% | 39% | 39% | 100% | 17% |
| B. Medium | 79% | 93% | 64% | 100% | 43% |
| C. Large | 84% | 95% | 89% | 100% | 64% |
| **Total of all Responses (Both Elected & Appointed)** | 51% | 70% | 62% | 99% | 30% |

## Table 3

**TYPES OF EVALUATION SYSTEMS UTILIZED: LISTED BY ADMINISTRATOR CATEGORY**

| | Checklist of Qualities or Competencies | Observation Record | Written Statement in Pers. Folder | Personal Conference | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assistant Superintendent | 17% | 29% | 15% | 50% | 1% |
| Supervisor | 24% | 41% | 22% | 64% | 2% |
| Other Cent. Off. Admin. | 22% | 37% | 20% | 58% | 1% |
| Principals | 32% | 54% | 28% | 87% | 2% |
| Other Bldg. Admin. | 15% | 24% | 12% | 34% | 1% |
| **Total Sample** | 22% | 37% | 19% | 59% | 1% |

## Table 4

**ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBLE FOR EVALUATING OTHER ADMINISTRATORS: LISTED BY ADMINISTRATOR CATEGORY**

| Position Evaluated | Superintendent | Assistant Superintendent | Curriculum Director | Superintendent | Personnel Department | Teachers | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assistant Superintendent | 63% | 4% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 4% |
| Supervisor | 50% | 22% | 9% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 4% |
| Other Central Office Admin. | 51% | 17% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 1% | 4% |
| Principals | 66% | 21% | 9% | 5% | 3% | 11% | 3% |
| Other Building Level Admin. | 25% | 11% | 4% | 7% | 2% | 2% | 10% |
| **Total Sample** | 55% | 15% | 6% | 4% | 2% | 3% | 5% |

## Table 5

### INDIVIDUALS WHO PARTICIPATED IN EVALUATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| Superintendent | 93% |
| Board of Education | 39% |
| Assistant Superintendent | 42% |
| Supervisors | 45% |
| Other Central Office Adm. | 35% |
| Principal | 57% |
| Other Building Administrators | 14% |
| Teachers | 28% |
| Outside Consultants | 13% |
| Others | 3% |

## Table 6

### SATISFACTION OF SUPERINTENDENTS WITH PRESENT EVALUATION SYSTEM: BY METHOD OF SUPERINTENDENT SELECTION

| | Appointed Superintendent | Elected Superintendent | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|
| Very Satisfied | 9% | 18% | 14% |
| Moderately Satisfied | 57% | 46% | 51% |
| Somewhat Dissatisfied | 34% | 36% | 35% |

## Table 7

### MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING EVALUATION SYSTEMS THOUGHT DESIRABLE

| | |
|---|---|
| Assessment of Administrator or Supervisory Competency | 29% |
| Management by Objectives | 11% |
| Evaluation Instrument or Checklist | 19% |
| Teachers Evaluate | 2% |
| Combinations of the Above Categories | 39% |

## How Principals Regard Their Own Evaluation

Phase II of the research consists of a representative sample of Georgia principals.

Principals interviewed had an experience range from that of first year on the job to 37 years in a principalship. Principals of different ages, races, and sexes were interviewed. Student population in the schools of interviewed principals ranged from 157 in an elementary school in a small system to 2200 students in a high school within a large school system.

All principals indicated they are evaluated primarily by the superintendent. However, a number were unsure of or unaware of what process was used for this evaluation. A large proportion of respondents indicated that there was no formal evaluation system—73.8 percent of the small district; 48.5 percent of the medium districts; 13.5 percent of the large districts. More principals from large districts (40.54 percent) report the use of a combination of evaluation methods than do either medium district principals (9 percent) or small district principals (4.6 percent).

Regarding the purpose for which the evaluation is used, respondents named most frequently a combination of developmental purposes and contract renewal. However, 70 principals indicated that they did not know did not respond to the purpose for evaluation in their system. More than one-third of the respondents report that their evaluation is for developmental purposes only, and 18.4 percent indicate evaluation is for contract renewal only.

A majority of principals in all district sizes indicate a satisfaction with their current evaluation process. Even though 73.8 percent of respondents from small districts indicate no formal method of evaluation, 65.6 percent report satisfaction with the method utilized. Nearly one-half (48.5 percent) of medium district respondents report no formal evaluation process, and 72.4 percent report satisfaction with the present method. In large systems, 13.7 percent indicate absence of formal evaluation procedures, and 57 percent report satisfaction with the current process. Interestingly, large school systems had both the greatest reported incidence of formalized evaluation processes (85 percent) and the highest percentage of dissatisfaction (40 percent). The conclusion of the researchers, however, is that the dissatisfaction expressed by the principals seems to be not so much with evaluation per se, as with the particular method (or lack thereof) employed in their system.

"All areas," "every phase," or "anything for which I am responsible" are by far the most frequent response by principals to a question about which areas of their jobs should be subject to evaluation. The next most frequent response to this question is some combination of the areas of finance, instruction, community relations, and administrative services—the four categories listed on the interview form. Only a small number of principals indicate they should be evaluated only on the instructional phase of their job (9); fewer

said only on administrative functions (4); fewer still indicated only community relations (3); no one said only on financial aspects. Finance also was the area most frequently excluded from the combinations listed by the principals, probably because many state they are already audited in this area.

Other areas that principals think should be evaluated include: communication, faculty morale, plant facilities, human relations, and school climate. One principal stated there should not be an evaluation of principals.

The majority of interviewed principals feel their evaluation should be conducted by a combination of people. Almost without exception the superintendent is included in this combination. Nineteen principals (14.07 percent) thought all choices on the survey questionnaire—self, teachers, students, parents, supervisors, peers, assistant superintendents, superintendent, board of education, curriculum director, personnel director—should be involved in the evaluation of principals in some way. Though many principals now feel the superintendent to be solely responsible for the evaluation of principals, only nine (6.6 percent) feel the superintendent only should be responsible.

A typical respondent listed people in both a superordinate and subordinate position to the principal for participation in principal evaluations. Most principals included themselves in the combination; only two principals said teachers only should evaluate principals; 51 respondents (40.74 percent) included other principals as part of their suggested evaluation team. On the other hand, 40 principals (29.63 percent) report their evaluation should be performed only by people in a superordinate position to that of the principal.

The researchers found a clear indication that a majority of principals feel "input' or "feedback" concerning their performance should be gathered from a number of sources, but the superintendent should remain responsible for making the final judgment concerning a principal's performance.

What form should this evaluation take? Some one-third (34.68 percent) of interviewed principals are interested in having a combination of procedures for evaluation rather than relying on one specific method. Some combination of a checklist and management by objectives received most frequent mention. Nearly 30 percent (29.3 percent) find the checklist alone a satisfactory evaluation form. Management by objectives alone is the preferred assessment method by 19.35 percent of the respondents. Acknowledging the time factor involved, many principals in larger systems still express a desire for an MBO approach, and 30 percent of principals in small districts also favor this method.

Most respondents feel that an annual evaluation is sufficient. However, 31.85 percent of interviewed principals feel evaluation should take place twice a year, and 13.33 percent feel evaluation should be done quarterly. Other isolated responses range from never to daily to once every three years.

Another indication arises which points out that principals generally believe evaluation should be broad based. This indication takes the form of responses to the question "What person(s) should be involved in the development of an evaluation process?". These eleven choices appeared on the questionnaire: principals, superintendent, assistant superintendent, parents, supervisors, board of education, students, teachers, other central office personnel, other building level administrators, and outside consultants. Seventeen principals (12.59 percent) report that all should participate. Only four (2.96 percent) respondents did not place the principal himself in the process. Eight respondents (5.93 percent) excluded the superintendent. A majority picked some combination of persons to be involved, with positions both superordinate and subordinate to the principal represented. Parents should be involved in evaluation of principals, according to 27 (20 percent) of the respondents. Over half (54.81 percent) of interviewed principals expressed an interest in evaluation as a means for self-improvement—both personally and professionally. Self-improvement and educational progress is seen by them as the central purpose for any meaningful evaluation program. They express such concern for themselves and for teachers. Less than one percent mention contract renewal as a meaningful use of evaluation. However, performance appraisal is recognized by them as one factor which may be used for employment purposes.

Interviewed principals also hold other opinions as to the possibilities/opportunities a more formalized evaluation program might offer them. A number (17.04 percent) are interested in systematic evaluation as a means to better understand their own performance and the expectations for their job. Another group (10.37 percent) sees formalized evaluation as a good way to improve communication between a principal and his superiors. Less than 4 percent say that a formal evaluation will have no advantage over their present program.

A large portion (43.75 percent) of interviewed principals feel no problems or concerns will be associated with a more formal method of evaluation. Many respondents, in fact, state they are not threatened by any type of evaluation regardless of how it is conducted because they are committed to their job and feel they are trying to do their best.

Others, however, voice concerns that fall generally into two categories: (1) formal evaluation programs can be highly subjective if not properly developed or used by knowledgeable persons; (2) concern for possible political use of evaluation methods, or vindictive uses in cases where personality conflicts exist.

In general, negative comments center around possible misuse or abuse of an evaluation program, not the program, or a more formalized program itself. Principals stress, however, that the important keys to successful administrator evaluation are (1) the competence of the person who is to perform the evaluation and (2) the validity of the instrument used.

# National Trends And Events

The concept of evaluation of school administrative personnel has evolved from a cursory, sometimes haphazard, often subjective procedure into an integral part of the total educational program.

This shift in emphasis appears to arise from the concurrent influence of a number of factors. More systematic appraisal programs for teachers, a broader definition of accountability, and the increasing need for school systems to justify the increasing costs of education—all have played a part in moving the role and functions of the educational administrator to the forefront.

In the early 1970's this emerging idea began to assume reality—through state legislative action and state school board policy. At least nine states—Florida, Washington, Oregon, California, Virginia, Connecticut, Nevada, Kansas, and Hawaii—are on record as supporting the importance of administrator evaluation, having implemented the practice throughout their state education programs. States such as Maine have begun to include administrator evaluation as one component of how the overall educational program can be improved in their states. Reports from other states indicate that some are moving toward legislated administrator evaluation.

To date, the process of administrator evaluation can be categorized into two major forms. Evaluation either uses lists of predetermined performance standards or delineates for each individual job performance goals derived through a cooperative effort. An apparent preference has emerged in favor of job performance goal setting, or as it is more generally known, management by objectives. This type of assessment seems to be gaining favor because of the opportunities for interaction it affords and because of its power to enhance the understanding of job expectations and to facilitate communication.

The number of states formalizing the process of administrator evaluation has grown. Evidence also indicates that numerous individual systems are also beginning to move in this direction. In Georgia, Project R. O. M. E. (Results Oriented Management in Education)—located in Thomas County—has been involved in investigating the competencies required for school administrators. (See Page 28 for more details.)

The trend seems to be in the direction of instituting more procedures for demonstrating that educational administrators are contributing to the success of the public school enterprise. Systems and states contemplating the addition of a formalized component of administrator evaluation might well review and study the attempts of others in order to profit from their success and to heed the cautions and concerns of those who first attempted this step.

In reviewing the literature, Commission researchers found several authors suggesting precautions to be taken before, during, and after implementing a program for the evaluation of administrators. However, no evidence appeared to dampen enthusiasm for adding this component to the educational process. Reviewed literature favors this approach and supports the belief that administrator evaluation in the field of education is a positive step—one that holds great promise for improving and strengthening the success of the total educational endeavor.

What has been done regarding administrator evaluation in other states? What does a review of the literature find regarding administrator evaluation? A summary look at some state-mandated programs and an examination of the literature follow.

## State-Mandated Programs

Briefly, major characteristics of various state plans are as follows.

**Florida:** In 1967 the Florida State Legislature mandated evaluation of all administrative and supervisory personnel for the stated purpose of improving the quality of administrative and supervisory performance. The State set the following guidelines for use by local systems in formulating appraisal plans:

- An assessment of each individual shall be made at least once a year;
- A written record of each assessment shall be made and maintained on file within the district;
- The principal or the person directly responsible for the supervision of the individual shall make one assessment of the individual to the superintendent and the school board for the purpose of contract review for continued employment;
- Prior to preparing the written report of the assessment, each individual shall be informed of the criteria and the procedure to be used;
- The written report of assessment for each individual shall be shown to and discussed with him/her by the person responsible for preparing the report.

**Washington:** In 1969 a law requiring evaluation of all certified educational personnel was enacted in Washington. Each local board is required to establish criteria and procedures through an appropriate negotiation process. Minimum criteria which local districts must use in evaluation include: (1) knowledge and scholarship in field of specialization, (2) specialized skills, (3) management of special and technical environment, (4) professional characteristics of support personnel, and (5) active involvement with pupils, parents, and education personnel.

Additional stipulations included in the State are that:

- Evaluation of all certified employees shall be conducted at least once a year;
- New employees must be evaluated within the first 90 calendar days of their employment;
- Every employee whose work is judged to be unsatisfactory must be so notified in writing and must be provided with recommendations for improvement no later than February of each year.

**Oregon:** In 1971 an Oregon statute was passed which obligated the superintendent of each school district to an annual evaluation of all teachers and administrators in school districts with a student population of 500 or more average daily attendance. The State further directed that the superintendent of each school district evaluate teachers and school administrators annually in order to allow the

district to measure the growth and development of all educational personnel.

The Oregon State Board of Education provided these guidelines for evaluation:

- The primary purpose of evaluation and supervision of professional performance is to promote personal growth and competence;
- Evaluation and supervision processes shall include provisions for objective judgment by qualified peers;
- Procedures shall be designed for the channeling of relevant information concerning performance from parents, students, board members, and other members of the community;
- Criteria for evaluation shall be clearly defined and made available to all personnel;
- Criteria for evaluation shall be adapted to the particular situation and professional responsibilities of the evaluatees; specific criteria shall be agreed upon by the evaluator and evaluatee prior to the beginning of the evaluation process;
- Genuine efforts shall be made to assist the staff member in improving professional performance;
- The evaluators of each staff member shall be clearly identified;
- The process of evaluation and supervision shall be continuous; personnel performances shall be observed periodically with a personal conference following each observation;
- Frequency of observation shall be increased for employees whose performance is in question so that maximum assistance is provided;
- Evaluations shall be based on the planning and organizing of instructional objectives, learning environment, human relationships and attitudes, professional preparation and growth, student achievement, performance of designated tasks, and ethical professional conduct.

**California**: The California "Stull Act" of 1972 requires the development and adoption at the district level of guidelines for the performance appraisal of all certificated personnel including administrators. An annual evaluation is specified for probationary (non-tenured) personnel and a biennial evaluation for permanent (tenured) personnel.

Each district must submit written guidelines to the California Board of Education for approval. In so doing, the board "must avail" itself of advice from the certificated personnel covered under the guidelines.

Four major criteria for evaluation are listed in the Stull Act:

- The establishment of standards for expected student progress in each area of study and techniques for the assessment of that progress;
- Assessment of certificated personnel competence as it relates to the established standards;
- Assessment of other duties normally required to be performed by certificated employees as an adjunct to their regular assignments;

• The establishment of procedures and techniques for ascertaining that the certificated employee is maintaining proper control and is preserving a suitable learning environment.

**Virginia:** The "Standards of Quality for Public Schools in Virginia" became law in 1972. It requires the evaluation of all principals and assistant principals by a standard of eight criteria which include:

• The principal is required to develop a school plan with the assistance of the community and staff;

• The principal must develop a handbook of policies and procedures;

• The principal coordinates the services of all persons working in the school;

• The principal assigns pupils to classes, programs, and activities;

• The principal provides instructional materials and equipment compatible with the educational needs of students;

• The principal and staff evaluate pupil progress and instructional effectiveness;

• The principal supervises instruction and assists teachers in meeting standards for classroom planning and management;

• The principal and his/her staff provide for the cooperative evaluation of teachers and other employees in his/her school.

Each district is required to submit its administrator evaluation plans for approval by the Virginia State Board of Education.

For the 1976-1978 biennium, the State Board adopted an addition to the "Standards of Quality" regarding planning and management objectives. The objectives, which complement the Standards, are to provide a sense of direction for the appraisal process.

**Connecticut:** The Connecticut General Assembly has mandated the annual evaluation of all certified employees below the rank of superintendent. In 1974 the General Assembly assigned the responsibility of developing evaluative criteria and procedures to the local superintendents. The State Department of Education provided the following guidelines for local use in the development of district appraisal plans:

• Each professional shall cooperatively determine with the evaluator(s) the objectives upon which his/her evaluation shall be based;

• The evaluation program shall be cooperatively planned, carried out, and evaluated by all levels of the staff;

• The purpose of the evaluation program shall be clearly stated in writing and well known to both the evaluators and those who are being evaluated;

• The general responsibilities and specific tasks of the teacher's position shall be comprehensively defined and this definition shall serve as the frame of reference for evaluation;

• The accountability relationship of each position shall be clearly determined. The teacher shall know and understand the

means by which he or she will be evaluated in relation to that position;

- Evaluations shall be more diagnostic than judgmental. The process should help analyze the teaching and learning process in order to plan how to improve;
- Evaluation shall take into account influences on the learning environment, such as materials and professional resources;
- Self evaluation should be an essential aspect of the program. Teachers should be given the opportunity to evaluate themselves in positive and constructive ways;
- The self-image and self-respect of teachers shall be maintained and enhanced. Positive self-concepts can be fostered by an effective evaluation plan;
- The nature of the evaluations shall be such that they encourage teacher creativity and experimentation in planning and guiding the teacher-learning experiences provided to children;
- The program should make ample provision for clear, personalized, constructive feedback.

**Nevada:** Nevada's plan for the evaluation of teachers and administrators was enacted by the Nevada Legislature in 1973. Each local board of school trustees is required to develop objective administrative policies and file them with the State Board of Education. The statute states that the program "may include self, student, administrative, or peer evaluation or any combination thereof." Moreover, each administrator is required to be evaluated in writing at least once a year.

**Kansas:** House Bill 1042, calling for the evaluation of all certified educational employees including administrators, was passed by the Kansas Legislature in 1973. The intent of the Act is to provide a systematic procedure for school personnel improvement on the job and to upgrade the educational program of the State. Local boards in Kansas must adhere to the following guidelines:

- Consideration should be given to the following personal qualities and attributes: efficiency, personal qualities, professional deportment, ability, health (both physical and mental), results and performance, including in the case of teachers the capacity to maintain control of students, and such other matters as may be deemed material;
- Community attitudes toward, support for, and expectations with regard to education programs should be reflected;
- The original policy and amendments thereto should be developed by the board in cooperation with the persons who are to be evaluated, and, to the extent practicable, consideration should be given to comments and suggestions from other community interests;
- Evaluations are to be made by personnel designated by the board. The board shall place primary responsibility upon members of the administrative staff in making such evaluations;,
- Persons to be evaluated should participate in their evaluations, including an opportunity for self-evaluation.

**Hawaii:** The evaluation of administrative personnel is mandated through a policy adopted by the Hawaii State Board of Education. A standardized instrument and procedure for its implementation were developed by the State Department of Education. (A sample of the "Principal Evaluation Report" used in Hawaii is presented in Appendix 2.)

**Maine:** Administrator evaluation is not officially mandated in Maine, but a program of school self-evaluation is required in Maine. The relevant statute allows much local discretion in designing the details of this self-evaluation which involves administrators as well as all other school personnel. The major intent behind this self-evaluation plan is to improve the total educational process in the State. Self-evaluation is required for administrators, teachers, pupils, parents, and community groups as designated in various sections of a published manual.

Maine's guidelines for evaluation include these:

- Principals should exercise their responsibility to advise the superintendent in selecting, dismissing, assigning, and promoting staff members under their supervision;
- All business of the individual school building should be channeled through the principal;
- Within the structure of policies developed by the school system, individual school regulations should be developed cooperatively by the principal and teachers with appropriate participation by pupils.

## National Trends

A survey in 1971 by the Educational Research Service reveals specific trends nationwide in the evaluative methods for both administrative and supervisory personnel. These findings indicate that the incidence of systematic evaluation of administrators has increased. For example, in 1964 only 50 evaluation programs were reported. In 1968 the number was 62; in 1971 the number had increased to 84. Large systems were found more likely to have a formalized evaluation program.

Additional patterns emerged from the ERS survey:

- In most systems the evaluation program applied to all administrative personnel;
- Among the various reasons advanced for evaluating administrative personnel, four appeared to dominate: (1) to identify areas needing improvement; (2) to measure current performance against prescribed standards; (3) to establish documentation for possible dismissal of administrators; (4) to enable an individual to formulate realistic performance objectives for himself herself;
- Seventy-five percent of the reporting school systems assessed effectiveness through the use of predetermined performance standards;
- The other 25 percent used individualized performance objectives which were cooperatively determined;
- Larger school systems tended to utilize predetermined per-

formance standards, whereas performance objectives were more generally found in the smaller systems;

• Assistance for the individual who received an unsatisfactory evaluation—usually in the form of counseling—was a component of almost all the programs.

Twelve basic types of evaluation procedures were identified in the 1971 ERS survey. The twelve fall into two broad areas. The first category includes those systems employing predetermined performance standards to be either numerically coded, completed by selecting a descriptive phrase, or by making written comments which can also include suggestions for improvement. This first category includes:

• Unilateral evaluation by evaluator, no evaluation conference(s); no notification of evaluation outcome to evaluatee unless unsatisfactory rating is given;

• Unilateral evaluation by evaluator; no evaluation conference(s), but evaluatee is either shown or given a copy of completed form;

• Unilateral evaluation by evaluator based on conference(s) between evaluator and evaluatee during evaluation period; no post-evaluation conference is held, but evaluatee is shown or given a copy of completed form or letter report;

• Unilateral evaluation by evaluator; post-evaluation conference between evaluator and evaluatee to discuss rating received; evaluatee may also be given or shown a copy of completed form;

• Evaluations are conducted by teams of educators; chairman compiles summary evaluation and holds post-evaluation conferences with evaluatee to discuss rating;

• Evaluator and evaluatee agree on major areas of responsibility for evaluatee; evaluator rates evaluatee on his performance in each major area; post-evaluation conference is held to discuss the evaluation;

• Evaluatee rates himself and evaluator rates evaluatee; these evaluations are discussed in a conference, but only the evaluator's rating—which may or may not be modified as a result of the conference—appears on completed form;

• Evaluatee rates himself and evaluator rates evaluatee; both evaluations are discussed in conference; both appear on completed form.

The second category—job performance goals—includes programs which tailor the objectives to the individual being assessed:

• Evaluatee completes a self-evaluation form, including establishing goals for next evaluation period; completed form is submitted to evaluator, who adds his comments to accuracy of evaluatee's evaluation. Post-evaluation conference is held to discuss completed form;

• Evaluator and evaluatee, in conference, establish mutually agreed upon performance goals for evaluatee, with his major areas of responsibility; evaluator rates evaluatee on his accomplishment of

performance goals and performance in areas of responsibility; post-evaluation conference is held to discuss the evaluation;

- Same as above, except that evaluatee completes a self-evaluation prior to conference with evaluator; evaluator places his evaluation on same form with evaluatee's; both evaluations are discussed in post-evaluation conference;

- Same as preceding, except evaluator consults with other individuals, including evaluatee's peers and/or staff, students, and parents before completing his part of the evaluation form; only evaluator's evaluation appears on completed form.

*The Competency Based Movement:* Teacher evaluation and administrator evaluation, in recent years, have become parts of the competency based movement. A conference on the specification of competencies for the principalship was jointly sponsored by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the Danforth Foundation in 1972. An entire issue of the *NASSP Bulletin* (March, 1972) is devoted to this topic.

Here in Georgia Project R. O. M. E. (Results Oriented Management in Education) was created in an attempt to develop prosesses and procedures for implementing competency-based evaluation for all administrators. Carried out under contract from the Georgia State Department of Education by Thomas County School administrators together with faculty of the College of Education, University of Georgia, this five-year project (1973-1978) was for the purpose of conducting a wide-ranging investigation of, in the words of project leaders, "the relationship between competency-based education concepts and the training of public school principals." R. O. M. E. was "actively involved in the identification and development, professional verification, and validation of competencies and performance indicators for building level administrators" in Georgia.

During the first year, "major activities were concentrated in three broad areas: (1) development of a list of competencies for building level administrators classified by major functional areas of administrative responsibility, (2) development of a prototypic instructional module for school planning activities, and (3) development of an administrative assessment system for measuring competencies of public school principals."

In the second project year, "338 competencies of school principals surviving a Statewide verification survey were utilized in the development of a comprehensive competency-based assessment system which was field tested in 45" Georgia schools. This system is titled the *Georgia Principal Assessment System* (see Page 31 for more details).

In the third year, "two components emerged: (1) the initial development and implementation of a field-based training program for 6th-year certification credit for active school principals (entitled FOCUS—Field-Oriented Competency Utilization System"; and (2) "the continued refinement and development of the GPAS . . . through the collection of an initial data base to be used for future

competency validation research."

Additional reports and documents were produced during the final year of the project. FOCUS and GPAS are described by the project staff as representing "a performance appraisal/staff development system aimed at school improvement for school principals."

In another study, a sample of secondary school principals, selected for overall excellence in developmental activities, rated 39 competency statements developed through an earlier job analysis of the principalship. After categorizing the ratings into seven major competency areas, the principals rated the seven as follows: (1) The Principal as a Leader in School Climate; *(tie)* (1) The Principal as a Leader in Community Relations; (3) The Principal and Staff Relations; (4) Instructional Leadership; (5) Program and Planning Ability; (6) Management Leadership; (7) Student Personnel Relationships.

Another comprehensive study of administrator performance standards led to an instrument designed for assessing the performance of principals in Mississippi. The overall purpose of the instrument is "to improve the administration and supervision of the educational units, programs, and instructional quality in the school system to provide the best possible education for children and youth." Consisting of 14 standards—with subcategories—the multi-page instrument has been in use in several states. Representatives of the United States Department of Justice and other legal counsel reviewed the instrument and found it to be non-discriminatory and to provide for due process.

*Client Centered Evaluation:* Another method of administrator evaluation receiving attention is the client-centered approach. The educator is evaluated by the "clients" whom the educator serves. For example, students rate teachers; teachers rate principals, etc.

*Management by Objectives:* Recent literature indicates a trend toward one type of evaluation process: the jobs-targets approach, also known as performance goals or management by objectives. This approach, based on the assumption that people want to do a good job, puts the responsibility on appraiser and appraisee to reach mutually agreed upon objectives. That mutual working relationship has been characterized in the following manner:

- Appraisee and appraiser are equally committed to the accomplishment of mutually formulated objectives;
- A clear understanding is ensured through the creation of cooperatively designed and formally written work plan;
- A monitoring system and a timetable for the accomplishment of various parts of the work plan are set in advance;
- Anticipated outcomes upon which the final evaluation will be made are mutually agreed upon;
- The appraisee is encouraged to self-assess his/her job performance and the degree to which the specific objectives were accomplished.

Among systems utilizing management by objectives programs are the Pensbury, Pennsylvania, school district (in the areas of curricu-

lum, instruction, and business affairs) and the Highland, Indiana, school district for all administrative and supervisory personnel other than the superintendent, who is evaluated by the Board of Trustees.

*Superintendents:* In 1975 the California School Boards Association issued a publication designed to aid board members in establishing procedures and priorities for evaluation of superintendents. This is cited as one example of a continuing and rising interest in evaluation of superintendents. The California document contains 150 criteria for evaluating the school district and 50 criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of a superintendent. The 50 criteria are organized under these headings: The Superintendent—Board Relationships; The Superintendent—Staff Relationships; The Superintendent—Community Relationships; Educational Leadership; Business and Financial Management; Personal Qualities. A revised edition of the document includes a copy of a ruling by the California Attorney General that a local school board can legally meet in executive session to evaluate the superintendent.

Another example of superintendent evaluation by the school board can be found in Fort Worth, Texas. The Fort Worth board has implemented a 21-item checklist for use by each board member to rate, anonymously, the superintendent on each item. Results are graphed; the composite score is discussed with the superintendent. Permission has been granted to other systems to adopt the Fort Worth model. Some have done so with their own local modification thereof. A copy of the Fort Worth instrument may be found in Appendix 3. One system's adaptation of it may be seen in Appendix 4.

## Update

The Commission has, since its initial research and recommendations, continued to monitor and examine national literature and research regarding administrator evaluation. That continued study indicates that the interest in, and concern about, administrator evaluation continues to grow.

Some of the more representative and pertinent information and opinion gleaned from that effort is—as space permits—summarized below.

*Superintendents:* A suggestion has been put forth that superintendents should take the initiative in superintendent evaluation and insist on participation in developing criteria therefor in an attitude of mutual trust. Superintendents, it is asserted, desire a system that (1) measures reality, (2) considers only the variables that can be controlled, (3) spells out clearly ahead of time what administrators are to be measured against, (4) is not subject to different conclusions by different evaluators, (5) permits superintendents to have some voice in determining the goals and criteria for measuring the attainment of the goals.

A New York survey of 450 superintendents revealed 77 formalized evaluations, 341 informal evaluations, and 27 checklists. Most evaluations took place in executive session. Over 52 percent were

informal conferences. Formalized job descriptions were reported by 223 persons in contract or board policy. Seventy-five contracts had procedures for evaluating performance. According to the survey, school boards and superintendents agree that the primary purpose of evaluation is (1) to identify areas needing improvement, (2) to provide accountability, (3) to point out areas of superintendent strengths, and (4) to help administrators establish relevant performance goals.

*Objectives:* From a series of workshops conducted by the Illinois Association of School Boards emerged the following (abbreviated here for space consideration) schedule for writing objectives for administrator evaluation: (1) determine need; (2) determine what is to be evaluated; (3) evaluate board-superintendent relationship; (4) ascertain management responsibilities in the district; (5) clarify roles; (6) develop indicators of effectiveness; (7) prepare job descriptions; (8) use checklists to discern areas of improvement; (9) clarify effectiveness indicators; (10) write objectives.

*Principals:* Here in Georgia the *Georgia Principal Assessment System* (GPAS) has been developed. (See Page 28.) The GPAS consists of four different forms of the Personnel Performance Description Survey (PPDS) to be completed by different assessment sources: (1) principals (2) teachers (3) external observers (4) superintendent or central office personnel. Though all should be completed, single separate ones may be used, its originators say. They further advise that the GPAS is designed to provide assessment of selected principal performance by a variety of sources, but not designed to render any formal "evaluation" of how well principals do their job nor to distinguish between "good" and "bad" and "mediocre" principals. It can, they suggest, be useful in formulating staff development activities based on needs assessment information. They further recommend that since one of the State Department of Education requirements for approved staff development plans is evidence of evaluation activities and effectiveness success, instrumentation in the GPAS can be used to identify performance needs and monitor improvement activities implemented for school principals during the course of staff development activities. And, they state, since the GPAS is designed for performance improvement, not performance evaluation, it is best viewed as a means of identifying actual performance areas needing improvement and structuring specific staff development goals.

A Western study of administrator evaluation plans centered on categories or areas covered in the plans and revealed some interesting results. Out of the seven plans studied, general areas of concern that could be classified under the following categories appeared in the parenthetical numbers: curriculum and instruction (6); staff and personnel (7); school building and equipment (5); school community relations (7); educational leadership (3); business management (2); organization of school activities (3).

A university-conducted examination of recent literature in the evaluation of principals, teachers, and students—examining over 300 pieces of relevant literature—found that administrators have

seldom been evaluated either on their own performance or on the performance of their school district. Superintendents, the survey found, because of the direct accountability to the school board, probably receive more evaluations than almost any other participant in the school process—except students. But the criteria on which superintendents are evaluated often have little relationship to the quality of their work or to the quality of the district program.

A speaker at a national symposium for education research strongly urged that the intent of evaluators should be to help the principal to understand better the complexities of the bureaucratic, cultural, political, legal, and fiscal environment of the school and to mirror for the principal his her behavior in relation to that environment. The prime focus, he urged, should be upon helping the principal to determine what changes in task priority and administrative style are likely to work better, to help the principal to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to make those changes, and to provide formative feedback on the process over time. Other ideas emerging from the speakers and papers at this symposium include the suggestions that efforts must go forward to identify the most plausible sources of the meaningful effects of administrative performance and to use those sources as a basis for assessing and improving performance. Another speaker answered in the affirmative his own question: should a system be designed which takes into consideration the reality of the situation which exists? And another symposium speaker posed these questions for evaluators of administrators:

- How can the evaluation of administrators be made non-threatening?
- Should the evaluation of administrators be for individual improvement or for decision regarding employment status?
- Should administrators be evaluated on process or product or both?
- Should the techniques used to evaluate administrators be objective or subjective?

The purpose of principal evaluation, literature continues to emphasize, is "to guide and counsel," not "to check up" on the evaluatee. To accomplish this goal seven steps are recommended: First, the principal must evaluate his own behavior and experience. Second, a panel should conduct a follow-up evaluation to "check on the subjective interpretations supplied by the principal." Third, criteria for both the self-evaluation and the follow-up evaluation should center around "areas of principal performance," including school organization; instruction program; schedules; accounts and other management matters; relationships with students, staff, community, and superiors; facilities; and "school climate."

After these criteria are outlined, evidence of the principal's performance within these areas must be collected. Finally, the evaluators should summarize the principal's performance in each of the areas and should provide "counseling action that is tailored to the specific needs of each principal."

Principal evaluation "should be a matching of intent to results,

a comparison of what was expected to happen with what did happen." This goal of administrator evaluation is infrequently realized under many existing evaluation procedures. For these procedures tend to emphasize past performance instead of future activity; hence, they fail to encourage administrative improvement.

Another version of the evaluation process for administrators includes eight steps: (1) job understanding—the administrator must know what is expected of him; (2) the definition of standards of excellence—stated in as concrete terms as possible; (3) definition of performance objectives—the "specific targets" on the road to achieving standards of excellence; (4) the program of action—how performance objectives are to be achieved; (5) self-assessment; (6) assessment by evaluator; (7) evaluation conference; (8) follow-up—the action resulting from evaluation.

*Legal base:* Literature continues to reflect the need for administrator plans that have a firm legal base. Managerial merit plans, according to the literature, typically suffer from three weaknesses: (1) vagueness of standards, (2) subjectivity, and (3) inconsistency among appraisers. When legal challenges to nonmanagerial employees have occurred, the courts have taken two different approaches: In Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) cases, the courts have tended to look to form; in Civil Rights cases, to substance. It is asserted that while most cases to date have addressed themselves to the legitimacy of promotions, the principles established therein are applicable to the merit-pay system as well. And, the literature suggests, an adequate evaluation procedure guarantees the rights of the individual administrators and provides the school with a firm legal basis for its personnel decisions, including promotion, dismissal, and other actions.

The literature on administrator evaluation continues to be both abundant and generally supportive. Articles containing both theory and practice abound. Many writers are indicating what should be done and why administrator evaluation should embody certain theoretical principles. Others are offering detailed examples of what is being done (and why and with what results) in their districts and schools.

Yet, it seems appropriate to close this examination with some other suggestions that can also be found in the literature and research. The use of checklist instruments is condemned by some because such instruments embody the weakness of emphasizing past performance instead of future activity (and, hence, they fail to encourage administrative improvement). Management by objectives (MBO) can lead the administrator to select only easily realizable goals and cause him to neglect the more complex and not-so-easily measureable aspect of administration, others warn. To help remedy this, MBO should be used in conjunction with other performance criteria. MBO should not be embraced as a cure-all for administrator evaluation ills.

# Administrator Evaluation Bibliography


Abbott, Max G. "Evaluating School Administrators: The Scope and Nature of Administrative Performance." Bloomington, Indiana, 1975. (Paper presented at the National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research.)

"Administrator Evaluation." Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Oregon University, 1977.

"Administrator Evaluation." The Best of ERIC Series, Number 1. Eugene Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Oregon University, 1974.

American Association of School Administrators. *How To Evaluate Administration and Supervisory Personnel.* AASA Executive Handbook Series, Vol. ix. American Association of School Administrators, 1977.

Anderson, C. J., A. S. Barr, and G. M. Bush. *Visiting the Teacher At Work.* New York: Appleton and Company, 1925.

Anderson, H. H. "The Measure of Domination and of Socially Integrative Behavior in Teachers' Contacts with Children." *Child Development.* 10 (1939), 73-87.

Baker, Michael E. *Management by Objectives for a School District's Administrative Staff.* Pittsburgh, Pa.: Carnegie-Mellon University, Educational Management Development Center, 1975.

Bales, R. F. *Interaction Process Analysis in Reading.* Mass.: Addison Wesley Press, Inc., 1950.

Barr, A. S., and W. H. Burton. *Supervision.* New York: Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1938.

Barraclough, Terry. *Administrator Evaluation.* Educational Management Review Series Number 15. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon University (ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management), 1973.

Barraclough, Terry. *Evaluation of School Administrators.* NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, Number Five. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1974.

Bassnight, Thomas A. and Benjamin W. Wolkinson. "Evaluating Managerial Performance: Is Your Appraisal System Legal?" *Employee Relations Law Journal,* 3 (Autumn, 1977), 240-254.

Booth, Ronald R. and Gerald R. Glaub. *Planned Appraisal for the Superintendent: A Performance-Based Program for School Boards and Superintendents: A Handbook.* Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1978.

Booth, Ronald R. and Gerald R. Glaub. *Ten Exercises Toward Planning a Superintendent Appraisal System: A Companion Workbook to Planned Appraisal of the Superintendent*. Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1978.

Bolton, Dale L. "Problems and Issues in the Evaluation of Administrative Performance." Bloomington, Indiana, 1975. (Paper presented at the National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research.)

Bursalioglu, Ziva. *Competencies of the Educational Administrator: A Study of the Competencies of the Principals of Normal Schools in Turkey*. Denver: CFK, Ltd., 1977.

California School Boards Association. *Guidelines for Evaluating a Superintendent*. (To Assist School Board Members in Planning and Evaluation). *Resources in Education*. 1976.

Collings, E. *School Supervision in Theory and Practice*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1927.

Connecticut, State of. *Teacher Evaluation in Connecticut*. Hartford: State Department of Education, 1977.

Deal, Terrence E., Sanford M. Dornbusch, and Robert A. Crawford. "Villains as Victims: Evaluating Principals." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 59 (December, 1977), 273-274.

Deluzain, Edward and Barry M. Cohen. "An Application of the Assessment Center in Education." *Planning and Changing*, 7 (Spring, 1976), 31-37.

Demont, B. C. "Directions for School Board Accountability: The Selection and Review of the School Executive." Houston, 1977. (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National School Boards Association.)

DeYoung, C. A. and R. Wynn. *American Education*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1972.

DeVaughn, J. E. *Manual for Developing Reasonable, Objective, Non-discrim[illegible] Standards for Evaluating Administrator Performanc[illegible] Mississippi State University: Mississippi Educational Serv[illegible]ter, 1971.

Durham, J. I. [illegible]ment By Objectives Can Be Meaningful to School Admin[illegible]ators, Others." *School Business Affairs*, 38 (October, 1972), 259-261.

Earles, James A. and William R. Winn. *Assessment Centers: An Annotated Bibliography*. Lackland Air Force Base, Texas: Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Personnel Research Division, 1977.

*Education Leadership by Objectives*. Highland, Indiana Superintendency Team Assessment Plan. Highland, Indiana: Superintendent of the Highland School, Educational Services Center, 1972.

Educational Research Service, Inc. *Evaluating Administrative Performance*. Washington, D. C.: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1968.

Educational Research Service, Inc. *Evaluating Administrative Supervisory Performance*. Washington, D. C.: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1971.

Educational Research Service, Inc. *Evaluating Administrative Performance*. Washington, D. C.: Educational Research, Inc., 1974.

Ellett, Chad D. *Results Oriented Management in Education. Project R. O. M. E. The Continued Refinement and Development of the Georgia Principal Assessment System and Its Application to a Field-Based Training Program for Public School Principals. Assessment Design—Procedures—Instrumentation—Field Test Results*. Final Report: Volume I. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, College of Education, 1976.

Ellett, Chad D. *Results Oriented Management in Education. Project R. O. M. E. The Continued Refinement and Development of the Georgia Principal Assessment System and Its Application to a Field-Based Training Program for Public School Principals. Assessment Design—Procedures—Instrumentation—Field Test Results*. Final Report: Volume II. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, College of Education, 1976.

Ellett, Chad D. *Understanding and Using the Georgia Principal Assessment System (GPAS)*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah University, Department of Educational Administration, 1978.

Ellman, N. "Administrative Style and Performance as Teachers See Them." New Orleans, 1977. (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of National Association of Secondary School Principals.)

*ERIC Abstracts: A Collection of ERIC Document Resumes on Competency Based Evaluation of Educational Staff*. ERIC Abstracts Series, Number Twenty-eight. Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators, (National Academy for School Executives, Eugene, Oregon, Oregon University), 1973.

Featherstone, Richard L. and Louis Romano. "Evaluation of Administrative Performance." *The Clearing House*, 50 (May, 1977), 412-415.

Flanders, N. A. *Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1965. (Cooperative Research Monograph, No. 12.)

Florida, State of. *Florida Statute, Section 231 29(2)*. Tallahassee: Florida State Department of Education, 1977.

Fowler, C. W. "When Superintendents Fail." *American School Board Journal*., 164(2), 21-23.

Gaslin, W. L. "Evaluation of Administrative Performance By a School's Teaching Staff." *NASSP Bulletin*, 58 (December, 1975).

Georgia Professional Standards Commission. "Current Evaluation Practices for Administrators in Georgia." (Unpublished paper.)

Gephart, William J. "Designing a Plan for Evaluating Administrative Performance." Bloomington, Indiana, 1975. (Paper presented at the National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research.)

Gephart, William J. and Others, ed. *The Evaluation of Administrative Performance: Parameters, Problems and Practices*. Phi Delta Kappa (P. O. Box 789): Bloomington, Indiana, 1975.

Gray, Frank. "Case Study Number One: Hyde Park, New York." Bloomington, Indiana, 1975. (Paper presented at the National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research.)

Gray, F. "How Successful Is Performance Evaluation." Dallas, 1975. (Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators.)

Hall, Phillip and Others. "A Teacher Evaluation-Supervision Model for a Small School District." Diss. Nova University, 1974.

Heller, Robert W. "Superintendent Evaluation." Anaheim, California, 1978. (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National School Boards Association.)

Herman, Jerry J. "Guidelines for Evaluating and Compensating Administrators." *NASSP Bulletin*, 61 (December, 1977), 1-9.

Hersey, Paul W. "An Introduction: NASSP's Assessment Center—from Concept to Practice." *NASSP Bulletin*, 61 (September, 1977), 74-76.

Housam, R. B. "Current Issues in Evaluation." *National Elementary Principal*. 52 (May, 1973), 12-17.

Ingle, Robert B. "Administrative Evaluation: A Caveat." Bloomington, Indiana, 1975. (Paper presented at the National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research.)

Ingraham, W. W., and J. E. Keefe. "Values of Management by Objectives." *School Management*, 16 (June, 1972), 28-29.

Jesse, K. A. "Calgary Board of Education Administrative Evaluation." Toronto, Canada, 1978. (Paper presented at the Canadian School Trustees' Association Congress on Education).

Jeswald, Thomas A. "A New Approach To Identifying Administrative Talent." *NASSP Bulletin*, 61 (Septemper, 1977), 79-83.

Jones, P. C. "How One School Board Judges, Rewards, and Penalizes Its Superintendent on the Basis of His Performance." *American School Board Journal*, 36 (February, 1974), 32-34.

Kansas, State of. "House Bill No. 1042: An Act Concerning the Evaluation of Teacher and Other School Employees." Provided by the Kansas State Department of Education, Topeka, Kansas, 1977.

Kerlinger, F. N. *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. New York.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Lamb, M. L., and K. J. Swick. "A Historical Overview of Classroom Teacher Observation." *The Educational Forum*. Jan., 1975, pp. 237-247.

Lewis, E. L. *Evaluation of a Superintendent*. California School Boards Association, 1977.

McCleary, L. E., and Others. "Assessing Competency Needs in Administration." Boseman, Montana, 1976. (Paper presented at the meeting of the NCPEA Interest Group on Competency-Based Education for Administration.)

Matthew, Marvin R. "Case Study Number Four: Los Angeles County, California." Bloomington, Indiana, 1975. (Paper presented at the National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research.)

Moffie, D. J. and Susan Goodner. *A Predictive Validity Study of Creative and Effective Managerial Performance*. Greensboro, North Carolina: Richardson Foundation (Creative Research Institute), 1967.

*More from PaCTBE: Inventories of Specialized Competencies*. Pennsylvania State Department of Education, Bureau of Academic Programs: Harrisburg, 1978.

Moses, Joseph L. "Developing an Assessment Center Program for School Administrators." *NAASP Bulletin*, 61 (September, 1977), 76-79.

Mouly, George J. *Educational Research: The Art and Science of Investigation*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.

Myers, David D. "An Assessor's View." *NASSP Bulletin*, 61 (September, 1977), 83-85.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. "National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin." No. 362, 56 (March, 1972).

Natriello, Gary and Others. *A Summary of the Recent Literature on the Evaluation of Principals, Teachers, and Students*. Occasional Paper No. 18. Stanford University, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1977.

Nevada, State of. "State Law 391-3127." Provided by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Carson City, Nevada, 1977.

Nutt, H. W. *The Supervision of Instruction*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920.

Oregon, State of. "Teacher Certification. Legislative Law 342.120." Provided by the State Department of Education, Salem, Oregon, 1977.

Payne, David A., Chad D. Ellett, Mark L. Perkins, and Alice B. Klein. "The Development and Validation of an Observation Instrument To Assess Competencies of School Principals." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 36 (Winter, 1976), 945-952.

Poliakoff L. L. *Evaluating School Personnel Today*. Research in Education, 1973, 02, ED 073045.

Price, N. C. "The Principal and the Stull Act." *NASSP Bulletin*. 57 (November, 1973), 66-72.

Project R. O. M. E. (Results Oriented Management in Education). *The Verification and Validation of Principal Competencies and Performance Indicators: Assessment Design-Procedures Instrumentation*. Field Test Results. Vols. 1, 2, 3. Resources in Education, 1976.

Redfern, George B. *Evaluating Teachers & Administrators: Putting the Pieces Together*. Westerville, Ohio: School Management Institute, 1978.

Redfern, G. E. "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why, and How?" *NASSP Bulletin*, 56 (May, 1972), 85-93.

Reemers, H. H. "Rating Methods in Research on Teaching." *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. Ed. N. L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Rentsch, George J. "Assessing Administrative Performance." *NASSP Bulletin*, 60 (September, 1976), 77-83.

Sanacore, Joseph. "Where It's Happening: How Teachers Can Evaluate Their Principal." *NASSP Bulletin*, 60 (October, 1976), 98-101.

*A School Improvement-Accountability Process Kit*. PAK No. 4.5—*Coaching and Appraising Staff Performance*. Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, District Planning and Accountability Services, 1975.

*The School Principal: Recommendations for Effective Leadership*. California State Legislature, Assembly: Sacramento, 1978.

Sciana, F. J., and R. K. Jantz. *Accountability in American Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Seal, Edgar Z. "Development, Implementation, and Evaluation of a Model Program for Evaluating School Principals." Diss. Nova University, 1970.

Spears, R. "Improving the Supervision of Instruction." New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953.

Speicher, D. "Evaluating Administrative and Supervisory Personnel." *Personnel News*, 37 (March, 1971), 2-10.

Sullivan, Daniel. "Case Study Number Three: Lake Washington School District, Washington." Bloomington, Indiana, 1975. (Paper presented at the National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research.)

Turner, L. L. "Your Superintendent: When to Recharge Him—Or Discharge Him." *American School Board Journal*. July, 1971.

Utermohlen, Charles R. "What Are You: Player or Prospect?" *NASSP Bulletin*, 60 (November, 1976), 58-61.

Virginia, State of. "Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia 1976-78." Provided by the State Department of Education of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia, 1977.

Wagner, C. A. *Common Sense in School Supervision*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1912.

Washington, State of. "Certification of Enrolled Enactment, Substitute House Bill No. 1364." Provided by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington, 1977.

Westcott, Robert F. "Slide Rule for the Personnel Manager." *Personnel Journal*, 54 (November, 1975), 584-586.

Weybright, Mary. "Reactions of an Assessee." *NASSP Bulletin*, 61 (September, 1977), 85-86.

Wills, Lewis A. *Evaluation of Administrators: Issues and Practices*. OSCC Bulletin Vol. 19, No. 10. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, 124 College of Education, Eugene, Oregon, 1976.

Ziehl, Donald C. "Case Study Number Two: La Canada Unified School District, California." Bloomington, Indiana, 1975. (Paper presented at the National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research.)

5. Supervisor's Recommendations:

☐ Renewal of Contract ☐ Nonrenewal of Contract

☐ Advancement in Salary ☐ No Advancement in Salary

☐ _____

Teacher's Comments: _____

_____

This is to certify that we have read and discussed the above report.

Identify attachments: _____ _____ _____

Teacher's Signature Date

_____ _____ _____

Supervisor's Signature Date

Oregon Board of Education
Form No. 81-501-1231

Chapter 577, *Oregon Laws 1971*

SECTION 5. (1) The district superintendent of every common and union high school district having an average daily membership, as defined in ORS 327.006, of more than 500 students in the district shall cause to have made at least annually an evaluation of performance for each teacher employed by the district in order to allow the teacher and the district to measure the teacher's development and growth in the teaching profession. A form shall be prescribed by the State Board of Education and completed pursuant to rules adopted by the district school board. The person or persons making the evaluations must hold teaching certificates. The evaluation shall be signed by the school official who supervises the teacher and by the teacher. A copy of the evaluation shall be delivered to the teacher.

(2) The annual evaluation records shall be maintained in the personnel files of the district.

(3) The annual evaluation report shall be placed in the teacher's personnel file only after reasonable notice to the teacher. Any explanation relating to the evaluation which the teacher desires to make shall be placed in the personnel file.

(4) The personnel file shall be open for inspection by such teacher but shall be open only to such other persons as are officially designated by the board or by the teacher, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the board shall adopt.

Completed in triplicate
Original for Personnel File
First Copy for Teacher
Pink Copy for Supervisor

_____, School District No. ____
_____, Oregon

## TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Name _____ Employee Status _____

Assignment _____ School _____

Instructions: This form is to be completed pursuant to rules adopted by the district school board. Use the back of this form, additional pages, and the district form for a complete evaluation to improve the quality of instruction. The evaluation form shall be delivered to the teacher and one copy maintained in the teacher's personnel file. This form may be duplicated as necessary.

"Teacher" means any person who holds a certificate as provided in ORS 342.125 who is employed on other than a part-time basis as an instructor or administrator.

1. The teacher met, failed to meet, or exceeded his or her performance goals and objectives during the evaluation period. (Explain)

*(Blank space has been omitted)*

2. In what areas has the teacher shown development and growth in the teaching profession?

*(Blank space has been omitted)*

3. In what specific areas does the teacher need to demonstrate additional development and growth? (Include suggestions for improvement.)

*(Blank space has been omitted)*



4. Additional comments:

*(Blank space has been omitted)*

b. Assignment of teachers and scheduling of classes . . . . . [ ] _____

c. Knowledge of curriculum . . . . . [ ] _____

d. Use of instructional aids & equipment . . . . . [ ] _____

e. Quality of program planning . . . . . [ ] _____

2. PUPIL PERSONNEL PROGRAM . . . . . [ ] . . . . . _____

a. Guidance Program . . . . . [ ] _____

b. Discipline . . . . . [ ] _____

c. Attendance . . . . . [ ] _____

d. Health & Safety Program . . . . . [ ] _____

3. STAFF RELATIONS . . . . . [ ] . . . . . _____

a. With teachers . . . . . [ ] _____

(1) Individually . . . . . [ ] _____

(2) As a group . . . . . [ ] _____

(3) Relations with employee organizations . . . . . [ ] _____

(4) Quality of professional faculty meetings . . . . . [ ] _____

b. With classified employees . . . . . [ ] _____

(Over)

Personnel Form 753
Rev. 2/71, TAC 11 24/8

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL SERVICES
P. O. BOX 2360
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96804

# PRINCIPAL EVALUATION REPORT

Principal's Name _____ School _____

Evaluated by _____ For the period _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Fill in the boxes to the right of the factors with the descriptive words poor, fair, satisfactory, good, or excellent. You will note that the factors are arranged in outline form. Every factor that is a heading is a summary of those subfactors specifically subsumed under it as well as those not specified but implied in the heading. Not all of the factors are of the same importance nor are identical factors of the same importance in every school. It is not intended that this form yield a "score". It is intended merely as a reminder that each of these factors needs to be considered objectively before making an overall judgment. Do not feel compelled to start at the top and work down. Start with factors about which you have the most information. If you do not have sufficient information to rate a factor, leave it blank. Individual items may be evaluated and dated during the semester.

| | | Date |
|---|---|---|
| OVERALL PERFORMANCE | | |
| 1. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM | | |
| a. Supervision & evaluation of teachers | | |
| (1) Regular teachers | | |
| (2) Probationary teachers | | |

REMARKS BY RATER:

REMARKS BY PRINCIPAL:

(Principal's signature does not necessarily indicate approval but merely that he is aware of evaluation)

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

District Superintendent's or Supervising Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

Distribution: WHITE - Office of Personnel Services, GOLDENROD - School, PINK - District, BLUE - Principal

(Continued)

| | | Date |
|---|---|---|
| 4. MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS | | |
| a. Physical Plant | | |
| b. Office Management | | |
| c. Finance | | |
| 5. COMMUNITY RELATIONS | | |
| a. With individual parents | | |
| b. With PTA | | |
| c. With other organizations | | |
| d. With other individuals | | |
| 6. DEPARTMENTAL RELATIONS | | |
| a. Knowledge of functions of other schools and parts of Department | | |
| b. Knowledge of Departmental policy and regulations | | |
| c. Cooperation with other schools and parts of Department | | |
| 7. EFFORTS TOWARD PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT | | |

# *How Fort Worth rates its superintendent*

Straightforward and simple, the Fort Worth technique for assessing and charting the superintendent's performance possesses none of the grand flourishes that sometimes make education's policy makers look foolish.

Here is the list of 21 qualifications used by the board of education in its yearly evaluation. Individual board members grade the superintendent on each qualification, using an *A* through *F* scale. The grades then are plotted on a graph similar to the one that appears below. The result, of course, is a composite board's-eye view of the superintendent's performance, indicating whether he should be rewarded, recharged, or discharged.

**Desirable Qualifications for Superintendent**

Please circle one letter after each qualification.

(1) Excellent health A B C D F
(2) High moral character A B C D F
(3) Pleasing personal appearance A B C D F
(4) Proper degree of confidence and idealism A B C D F
(5) Good judgment, common sense, and perception A B C D F
(6) Sound philosophy of education and its role in life A B C D F
(7) Deep-seated belief that the public schools are operated for the benefit of the children and the adults enrolled in them — not for boards, administrators, teachers or parents A B C D F
(8) Broad administrative experience, preferably in medium or large-size school system(s) A B C D F
(9) Varied accomplishments A B C D F
(10) Demonstrated ability to make decisions promptly and correctly A B C D F
(11) Proven ability to lead and to shoulder responsibility A B C D F
(12) Aggressive about upgrading the public school system A B C D F
(13) A pronounced interest in improving the instructional program A B C D F
(14) An open mind about the status quo and the many changes facing public education A B C D F
(15) Ability to organize effectively and to plan ahead to meet the school system's problems A B C D F
(16) Competence in business management; personnel administration; plant operation and maintenance; personal, community, and press relations A B C D F
(17) Appreciation of the need for close working relationships with teachers and board members and the general public and agencies in a position to improve public education A B C D F
(18) Unquestioned courage, integrity and honesty A B C D F
(19) Ability to face controversy, to remain true to convictions, and to live with a high-pressure job A B C D F
(20) Ability to delegate authority and to expedite A B C D F
(21) Ability to speak and write acceptably A B C D F

## *How the board plots its rating*

| E | D | C | B | A | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Health |
| | | | | | Morals |
| | | | | | Appearance |
| | | | | | Confidence |
| | | | | | Judgment |
| | | | | | Philosophy |
| DISCHARGE | | RECHARGE | | REWARD | Belief in children |
| | | | | | Administrative experience |
| | | | | | Accomplishments |
| | | | | | Decision making |
| | | | | | Leadership and responsibility |
| | | | | | Aggressiveness about upgrading schools |
| | | | | | Interest in improving instruction |
| | | | | | Receptivity to change |
| | | | | | Ability to organize and plan |
| | | | | | Over-all competence |
| | | | | | Cooperation |
| | | | | | Courage and integrity |
| | | | | | Ability to face controversy |
| | | | | | Ability to delegate |
| | | | | | Speaking and writing |

## *And here's how Tulsa does it*

An indication of how well the Fort Worth school board's method of evaluating the superintendent is catching on can be seen in the following example. This is the superintendent evaluation form being used by the Tulsa school board. Tulsa boardmen, while not differing significantly in essential judgments from their Fort Worth colleagues, have indeed injected their own ideas into their evaluation method.

**Rating instructions.** Rate the superintendent on each of the items listed here, using a 1 to 5 scale (1 is excellent; 3 is average; 5 is poor).

_____ 1. **Public relations** — availability to the press, PTA and various community groups with special or general interests in education, to interpret school programs and personal needs.

_____ 2. **Legislative role** — maintains liaison with state and federal legislators in effort to accomplish legislation needed for school improvement.

_____ 3. **Employe morale** — seeks to foster high morale and cohesiveness among such employe groups as supervisors, teachers, principals, superintendent's staff.

_____ 4. **Board relationship** — keeps board adequately informed of developments and administrative actions; helps achieve unity among diverse viewpoints and yet remains responsive to particular interests of individual board members.

_____ 5. **Exemplifies district philosophy** — seeks to achieve community understanding of educational goals for the district; attempts to obtain support among the groups for progress in developing a system sensitive to change as student needs and societal conditions would indicate.

_____ 6. **Management techniques**

- _____ Adheres to policies of the board of education.
- _____ Establishes lines of responsibility clearly among staff.
- _____ Budget preparation and executive process.
- _____ Job description — performance appraisal of employes.
- _____ Eliciting staff leadership capabilities.
- _____ Effective planning skills.
- _____ Organization responsive to school problems.
- _____ General decision-making process.
- _____ Appropriate personnel assignments.
- _____ Curriculum and program planning.

_____ 7. **Professional growth** — participates personally in professional activities and encourages employes to engage in self-improvement programs that expose them to new developments in their fields.